

EXHIBIT C

ERRATA TO REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF PETER S. ARCIDIACONO

**Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. Harvard
No. 14-cv-14176-ADB (D. Mass)**

In my rebuttal report, I presented secondary evidence that corroborated my primary statistical finding that Harvard imposed a floor on the single-race African-American admit rate for the post-2016 admissions cycles. This secondary evidence consisted of comparisons between single-race and multi-race African-American applicants in the period before and after the time when Harvard implemented this floor. First, I presented the following results on the academic index:

- 1) In the pre-2017 admissions cycles, single-race African-American admits had academic indexes that were on average very similar to those of multi-race African-American admits.
- 2) In the post-2016 admissions cycles, single-race African-American admits had significantly lower academic indexes than multi-race African-American admits.
- 3) Taking the “double difference” demonstrated that the academic indexes for single-race admits relative to multi-race admits were lower in the post-2016 period.

Arcidiacono Rebuttal Report 59-60. Second, I presented similar results relating to the comparative admit rates of single-race and multi-race African-American applicants. Id. 60-61.

In paragraph 164 of his rebuttal report, Professor Card correctly identified a calculation error when constructing standard errors for difference-in-differences estimates (point 3 above). Card Rebuttal Report ¶ 164. This error, however, does not affect the magnitude of the estimated double differences in the comparative academic indexes and admit rates (both of which are very large); it affects only the standard error calculations. Even then, as Professor Card’s workpaper shows, when the correct standard errors are calculated, the double differences remain significant for the academic indexes at an 8.4% significance level and for the admit rates at a 9.3% significance level. Notably, Professor Card does not dispute my primary statistical finding (except to claim that it is coincidental); and the secondary evidence discussed here (and in my rebuttal report) still corroborates that primary finding.

Dated: April 6, 2018

/s/Peter S. Arcidiacono
Peter S. Arcidiacono